

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated as mailed October 21, 2005 and the document cited therewith and the present response has been prepared in response thereto. The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 8, and 9 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent 5,168,839 to Hitomi et al. Specifically, Examiner refers to Figures 3 and 4 for this rejection. It is submitted the claims are not anticipated by the '839 patent and that the claims define over the art of record. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration in view of the remarks made below.

A review of the '839 patent shows that the reference does not anticipate the claims for at least the following reasons. In claim 5, the side wall of the housing has a substantially planar side wall interior cavity surface, whereas in the '839 patent, the side wall of the convergent portion 15 is substantially curved as presented in Figures 3 and 4. More significantly, in claim 5, the side wall of the housing defines at least one air-fuel out-flow passage from the interior cavity of the housing to the exterior surface, whereas in the '839 patent, the air-fuel out-flow-passages 11 is not defined by the side wall of the housing defining the interior cavity but rather constitute passages extending from the side wall. Further, because the air-fuel out-flow passage in the '839 patent extends from the side wall (rather than being defined by the side wall as in claim 5), the fuel in-flow passage 20 goes from the exterior surface to the air-fuel out-flow passage 11 at a point exterior to the side wall of the housing, as more clearly seen in Figures 6, 7, and 8. However, in claims 5, 8, and 9, the fuel in-flow passage goes from the exterior surface to the air-fuel out-flow passage at a point within the side wall, between the interior cavity and the exterior surface.

Therefore, in light of the foregoing distinctions, the present invention is not anticipated by the '839 patent. Thus it is submitted that rejection of claims 5, 8, and 9 as being anticipated by the reference should be withdrawn. Claims 5, 8, and 9 define over the art of record and should be allowed.

Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiners attention to and assistance with this application. Reconsideration and allowance is hereby requested. No additional fee is due. If the Examiner has any questions or anticipates not allowing the application due to some matter that Applicant has overlooked, a telephone interview is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Lee Roe

Date: January 20, 2005

By:



John E. Slaughter

Registration No. 43,923

Moore & Van Allen PLLC

430 Davis Dr.

P.O. Box 13706

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Telephone: (919) 286-8000

Facsimile: (919) 286-8199